

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-89 currently remain in the application. Claims 1, 57, 80 and 81 have been amended. Claim 7 has been cancelled.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejected claims 1-89 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Acres 6, 319, 125. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Acres, in FIG. 9A, 9B and 9C and Cols. 25-27, shows and describes a design for a card reader that includes a lighted Bezel. The lighted Bezel includes a printed bezel board 94 with LEDs. The bezel board has an opening that is wide enough to allow a magnetic card to enter the card reader (Col. 27:1-14). The bezel board is mounted directly to the face of the card reader (Col. 25: 24-28). The card reader interface is coupled to bezel board (Col. 26: 49-52). In contrast, in the present invention, one or more of illumination devices are coupled to the front panel of the player tracking unit with a display. The one or more illumination devices are adjacent to the display for conveying information related to functions of the player tracking unit wherein the one or more illumination devices are operable to convey information for a game player on a gaming machine and the one or more illumination devices surround a portion of a perimeter of the display.

The Acres design would require modification to be moved from around the card reader to around the display. For instance, the opening for a card reader is smaller than a typical display and an appropriate mounting scheme would have to be designed. Acres does not describe teachings or motivation for this redesign. An advantage of the design of the present invention is that textual messages on the display may be combined with visual information supplied from the one or more illumination devices. For instance, when a card is inserted incorrectly into the card reader, the illumination device around the display may be lit up as red and a textual message on the display may read "card inserted incorrectly." With the illumination device adjacent to the display, this information may be conveyed more clearly and easily to the player than when the illumination device and display are non-adjacent because the proximity of the information sources (i.e., the illumination device and the display) implies a relationship between the sources. Another advantage of the present invention is for player tracking designs that do not include a card reader. In this case, a lighted bezel designed for placement around a card reader might not make sense on the player tracking unit.

Examiner states that "*it would have been obvious to a person in the skill of art at the time the invention was made to place the illumination device adjacent to the display, since arranging*

*an illumination device at a specific location preferred by a designer requires only routine skill in the art.*" MPEP 2143.01 (page 2100-126) states "A statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been well within the ordinary skill in the art at the time the reference was made because the references relied upon teaching that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some object reason to combine the teachings of the references." Examiner in regards to claim 1 and many of the dependent claims has not provided an object reason to combine the teachings of the references. Thus, applicant does not believe a case of *prima facie* obviousness has been established.

In conclusion, for at least the reasons described above, Acres can't be said to render the present invention as recited in claims 1-89 obvious and the rejection of claims 1-89 is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



David P. Olynick  
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
510-843-6200